

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 5-6 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Nanno et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,909,413), which is equivalent to WO02/35507. Claims 1-4, 7-11, and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Owaku et al.* (JP 10-232652) in view of *Isozaki* (U.S. Patent 5,576,737). Claims 12 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Owaku et al.* in view of *Isozaki*, and further in view of *Ishiyama* (U.S. Publication 2003/0053321).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 5 and 18. Applicants have canceled claims 1-4, 7-17, and 21. Accordingly, claims 5, 6, and 18-20 are pending for further consideration.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 5-6 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Nanno et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,909,413), which is equivalent to WO02/35507. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 5, as amended, recites “supplying the power source voltage to digital circuit devices including an interface circuit, a timing controller, a data driving circuit, and a gate driving circuit for processing digital signal, wherein the interface circuit includes a low voltage differential signaling receiver which lowers a voltage level of the signals input from the system to thereby reduce the number of signal lines needed to the system and the timing controller,” (emphasis added). In contrast, FIG. 9 of *Nanno et al.* merely discloses a power supply circuit 24

supplying a power source to the source driver circuit 22A, gate driver circuit 21, and a driver circuit applying compensation voltage 23.

The Final Office Action suggests that the power supply 24 of *Nanno et al.* is the interface circuit, as claimed. Applicants respectfully assert that *Nanno et al.* is silent as to supplying a power source to an interface circuit, a timing controller, and a data driving circuit, wherein the interface circuit includes a low voltage differential signaling receiver which lowers a voltage level of the signals input from the system to thereby reduce the number of signal lines needed to the system and the timing controller, as required by independent claim 5, as amended.

In addition, the Final Office Action suggests that the start pulse circuits and transfer clock circuits embedded into data and gate drivers (col. 7, lines 40-54 of *Nanno et al.*) are timing circuits. Applicants respectfully assert that col. 7, lines 40-54 of *Nanno et al.* is still completely silent as to a timing controller. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) should be withdrawn because *Nanno et al.* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 5. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 18 is allowable for similar reasons and that dependent claims 6, 19, and 20 are allowable at least because of their dependence from the independent claims.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7-11, and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Owaku et al.* (JP 10-232652) in view of *Isozaki* (U.S. Patent 5,576,737).

Claims 12 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Owaku et al.* in view of *Isozaki*, and further in view of *Ishiyama* (U.S. Publication 2003/0053321).

Without acquiescing to the rejections, Applicants cancel claims 1-4, 7-17, and 21 to advance prosecution.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: April 9, 2007

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000